



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,307	08/26/2003	Masanori Honda	16869N-091900US	5407

20350 7590 10/27/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

TAN, ALVIN H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,307	HONDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alvin H. Tan	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-14, 16-20 have been examined and rejected. This Office action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/3/05, which has been entered in the above identified application.

Drawings

2. The arguments to the drawings have been considered and the objections to figures 1, 13, and 14 of the drawings have been withdrawn.

Specification

3. The corrections to the specification have been approved, and the objections to the specification are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The corrections to claims 3, 13, and 16-20 have been approved, and the rejections to the claims are withdrawn.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. On *[page 3, paragraph 2, last sentence]* of the specification, applicants state, "The user interface may be such a window or may be based on perception in any of the five sense including hearing." Applicants have not disclosed how the user interface may be based on taste, touch, smell, or hearing. Thus, the user interface, as stated in the claims and defined in the specification, is not described in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the computer-readable storage medium" in *[line 11]* of the claim. It is unclear as to which computer-readable storage medium is being referred to *[see lines 1 and 4]* of the claim.

- b. Claim 14 recites the limitation "the computer-readable storage medium" in *[line 10]* of the claim. It is unclear as to which computer-readable storage medium is being referred to *[see lines 1 and 3]* of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. The corrections to claims 1-6 and 12 have been approved, and the rejections to the claims are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-5, 9-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Park et al (Pub. No US 2001/0039594 A1).

Claims 1-5, 9

- 11-1. Regarding claim 1, Park anticipates the claim of a job management method comprising storing a stencil for a job definition statement, by teaching a template script contained within a workflow template file *[paragraph 56, lines 5-7]* along with workflow

markup that sets the workflow rules *[paragraph 44, lines 1-3]* used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park anticipates data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup, by teaching that a job may be created through end-user input from a browser interface *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches wherein the data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup is used to produce a user interface for generating a job definition statement, by disclosing that the browser creates one or more workflow forms *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, which are created based on information in a workflow template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup.

Park anticipates generating data for executing a process for generating a job definition statement based on contents set by a user via the user interface in accordance with the stencil for the job definition statement and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup and generating the job definition statement by executing the process in accordance with the generated data, by teaching a technique for creating a job that automatically generates separate job specification files for each distinct set of user inputs *[paragraph 41, lines 15-18]* by using a workflow template file (containing a template script and workflow markup) along with user input *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches that the stencil and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup are stored in the computer-readable storage medium, by disclosing that a development server includes a conventional memory and a conventional processor which implements the website development methods of the present invention by executing software stored in memory *[paragraph 21, lines 1-5]*. Thus, the workflow template files, scripts, and forms are stored in memory, prior for generating data for executing the process.

11-2. Regarding claim 2, Park anticipates the claim of the method wherein the stencil for the job definition statement is written in XML format, by teaching that the workflow template file containing the workflow markup and template script elements used to define the workflow markups is an XML file *[paragraph 41, lines 2-3]*.

11-3. Regarding claim 3, Park teaches the claim of the method wherein the data prescribing the user interface for setting the job definition statement is written in XML format and positioned in a file in which the stencil for the job definition statement is written, by teaching that a job may be created through a combination of workflow rules defined in a workflow template file (e.g., an XML file) and end-user input from the browser interface. The workflow rules of the template and user input may be interpreted by a common gateway interface to dynamically create a job specification file *[paragraph 41, lines 4-13]*. Based on the workflow markup, the instantiator CGI creates one or more workflow forms into which a user can enter workflow configuration information via the

browser *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*. The template script and workflow markup that make up the stencil are contained within the workflow template file *[paragraph 56, lines 5-7]*.

11-4. Regarding claim 4, Park anticipates the claim of the method wherein the user interface is capable of opening a window, which is organized to prompt a user for setup, in order to prompt the user to set the job definition statement, by teaching a browser interface GUI that lets a user select a workflow template, such as from a menu item *[paragraph 50, lines 1-3]*.

11-5. Regarding claim 5, Park anticipates the claim of the method wherein the data prescribing the user interface for setting the job definition statement contains control data for specifying whether the window should display user-definable options, by teaching that a workflow template file can contain <template_script> elements, including a set of directives to define the workflow markups *[paragraph 56, lines 5-7]*. The template scripts may modify the workflow forms, onto which a user can enter configuration information to create a job specification *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*.

11-6. Regarding claim 9, Park anticipates the claim of the method wherein the job definition statement contains a definition statement for setting a job network that executes a stream of a plurality of jobs, by teaching a <submittask> element that may perform a submit operation (to a staging area) on its contained files. If successful,

specified successor tasks may be signaled *[paragraph 37, lines 14-16]*. Thus, a plurality of jobs would be executed after the current task is completed.

Claims 10-11

11-7. Regarding claim 10, it is similar to claim 1 except that it claims a system instead of a method. Therefore, it is rejected under the same reasons as claim 1 above. See section 9-1.

Park anticipates the claim of a system comprising storing a stencil for a job definition statement, by teaching a template script contained within a workflow template file *[paragraph 56, lines 5-7]* along with workflow markup that sets the workflow rules *[paragraph 44, lines 1-3]* used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park anticipates data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup, by teaching that a job may be created through end-user input from a browser interface *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches wherein the data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup is used to produce a user interface for generating a job definition statement, by disclosing that the browser creates one or more workflow forms *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, which are created based on information in a workflow template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup.

Park anticipates generating data for executing a process for generating a job definition statement based on contents set by a user via the user interface in accordance with the stencil for the job definition statement and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup and generating the job definition statement by executing the process in accordance with the generated data, by teaching a technique for creating a job that automatically generates separate job specification files for each distinct set of user inputs *[paragraph 41, lines 15-18]* by using a workflow template file (containing a template script and workflow markup) along with user input *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches that the stencil and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup are stored in the computer-readable storage medium, by disclosing that a development server includes a conventional memory and a conventional processor which implements the website development methods of the present invention by executing software stored in memory *[paragraph 21, lines 1-5]*. Thus, the workflow template files, scripts, and forms are stored in memory, prior for generating data for executing the process.

11-8. Regarding claim 11, Park anticipates the claim of the system further comprising means for importing or exporting the stencil for the job definition statement that is managed as data in file form, by teaching that a job may be created through a combination of workflow rules defined in a workflow template file (e.g., an XML file) and end-user input from the browser interface. The workflow rules of the template and user

input may be interpreted by a common gateway interface to dynamically create a job specification file. Once configured, this technique simplifies the process of defining jobs since it provides a browser interface for user input and automatically generates separate job specification files for each distinct set of user inputs *[paragraph 41, lines 4-18]*.

Claim 12

11-9. Regarding claim 12, it is similar to claim 1 except that it claims a computer readable medium comprising code instead of a method. Therefore, it is rejected under the same reasons as claim 1 above. See section 9-1.

Park anticipates the claim of a computer readable medium having a program comprising code for storing a stencil for a job definition statement, by teaching a template script contained within a workflow template file *[paragraph 56, lines 5-7]* along with workflow markup that sets the workflow rules *[paragraph 44, lines 1-3]* used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park anticipates data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup, by teaching that a job may be created through end-user input from a browser interface *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches wherein the data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup is used to produce a user interface for generating a job definition statement, by disclosing that the browser creates one or more workflow forms *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, which are created based on information in a workflow

template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup.

Park anticipates generating data for executing a process for generating a job definition statement based on contents set by a user via the user interface in accordance with the stencil for the job definition statement and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup and generating the job definition statement by executing the process in accordance with the generated data, by teaching a technique for creating a job that automatically generates separate job specification files for each distinct set of user inputs *[paragraph 41, lines 15-18]* by using a workflow template file (containing a template script and workflow markup) along with user input *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches that the stencil and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup are stored in the computer-readable storage medium, by disclosing that a development server includes a conventional memory and a conventional processor which implements the website development methods of the present invention by executing software stored in memory *[paragraph 21, lines 1-5]*. Thus, the workflow template files, scripts, and forms are stored in memory, prior for generating data for executing the process.

Claim 13

11-10. Regarding claim 13, Park anticipates a computer readable storage medium having a program comprising code for generating a job definition statement based on contents set by a user via a user interface in accordance with a stencil for the job definition statement and data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup, by teaching a technique for creating a job that automatically generates separate job specification files for each distinct set of user inputs *[paragraph 41, lines 15-18]* by using a workflow template file (containing a template script) along with user input *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park anticipates data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup, by teaching that a job may be created through end-user input from a browser interface *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches that the stencil and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup are stored in a computer-readable storage medium, by disclosing that a development server includes a conventional memory and a conventional processor which implements the website development methods of the present invention by executing software stored in memory *[paragraph 21, lines 1-5]*. Thus, the workflow template files, scripts, and forms are stored in memory, prior for generating data for executing the process.

Park teaches wherein the data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup is used to produce a user interface for generating a job definition statement, by disclosing that the browser creates one or more workflow forms

[paragraph 52, lines 1-4], which are created based on information in a workflow template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup.

Claim 14

11-11. Regarding claim 14, it is similar to claim 1 except that it claims a computer readable medium comprising means for claim 1 instead of a method. Therefore, it is rejected under the same reasons as claim 1 above. See section 9-1.

Park anticipates the claim of a computer readable medium having a program for storing a stencil for a job definition statement, by teaching a template script contained within a workflow template file *[paragraph 56, lines 5-7]* along with workflow markup that sets the workflow rules *[paragraph 44, lines 1-3]* used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park anticipates data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup, by teaching that a job may be created through end-user input from a browser interface *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches wherein the data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup is used to produce a user interface for generating a job definition statement, by disclosing that the browser creates one or more workflow forms *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, which are created based on information in a workflow

template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup.

Park anticipates generating data for executing a process for generating a job definition statement based on contents set by a user via the user interface in accordance with the stencil for the job definition statement and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup and generating the job definition statement by executing the process in accordance with the generated data, by teaching a technique for creating a job that automatically generates separate job specification files for each distinct set of user inputs *[paragraph 41, lines 15-18]* by using a workflow template file (containing a template script and workflow markup) along with user input *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches that the stencil and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup are stored in a computer-readable storage medium, by disclosing that a development server includes a conventional memory and a conventional processor which implements the website development methods of the present invention by executing software stored in memory *[paragraph 21, lines 1-5]*. Thus, the workflow template files, scripts, and forms are stored in memory, prior for generating data for executing the process.

Claims 16-20

11-12. Regarding claim 16, Park anticipates a storage system which includes a storage device *[figure 1, reference character 112]* for storing data for use in an operation server and a management server *[figure 1, reference character 104]* for managing the operation of the storage device, defining a job targeted for execution as a policy rule, and executing a process in compliance with the policy rule (server "104" implements the methods of the invention disclosed by Park *[paragraph 21, lines 1-4]*), the storage system comprising a storage section configured to store information about data concerning the policy rule and data prescribing a user interface for setting the policy rule, by teaching that a job specification file may describe a single job and may be stored in the memory 112 *[paragraph 34, lines 5-7]*.

Park anticipates a policy wizard GUI (browser interface used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 50, lines 1-3]*) which is configured to read the element attribute information about a policy rule from the storage section, process an element of a wizard page defining a guidance window for policy setup, and generate a wizard window, by teaching that based upon the workflow markup, the instantiator CGI creates one or more workflow forms into which a user can enter workflow configuration information via the browser *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*. The workflow forms are created based on information in a workflow template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup.

Park anticipates the policy wizard GUI configured to enter policy rule setup information via the user interface in compliance with an instruction displayed by the generated window, by teaching that the user enters workflow configuration information via the browser *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, which is verified and if the input does not meet all necessary criteria, the interface re-prompts the user so that data can be re-entered *[paragraph 53, lines 1-7]*, the configuration information used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 54, lines 1-5]*.

Park anticipates the policy wizard GUI configured to generate a policy rule in accordance with the information entered via the user interface, by teaching that the browser interface is used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 54, lines 1-5]*.

11-13. Regarding claim 17, Park anticipates the claim of the system wherein the policy rule set via the user interface is stored in XML format in the storage section, by teaching that the job specification file is in XML format *[paragraph 41, lines 2-3]*.

11-14. Regarding claim 18, Park anticipates the claim of the system wherein a policy template, defining data for executing a policy rule generation process in accordance with contents set by a user via the user interface, contains information about a policy guidance window serving as the user interface and information about a generated policy definition XML file, by teaching a workflow template file contains any or all of the elements that are valid in a job specification file. These elements form the set of general

Art Unit: 2173

workflow configuration instructions that are used when the user inputs configuration information via the browser *[paragraph 56, lines 1-5]*.

11-15. Regarding claim 19, Park anticipates the claim of the system wherein the policy rule generated by the policy wizard GUI is delivered to a policy execution engine and registered, by teaching that once a job specification is created, it is instantiated into the server and started in the server-side workflow subsystem *[paragraph 54, lines 8-10]*.

11-16. Regarding claim 20, Park anticipates the claim of the system wherein the storage section stores beforehand information about instances of data concerning the policy rule and information about instances of data prescribing a user interface for setting the policy rule, by teaching that a user may select a workflow template for defining a job *[paragraph 50, lines 1-3]*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al (Pub No US 2001/0039594 A1) and Internet Explorer, as taught by McFedries (1997).

Claim 6

13-1. Regarding claim 6, Park teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See sections 11-1 and 11-4. Park teaches the claim of a job management method comprising storing a stencil for a job definition statement, by teaching a template script contained within a workflow template file *[paragraph 56, lines 5-7]* along with workflow markup that sets the workflow rules *[paragraph 44, lines 1-3]* used to create a job specification file *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup, by disclosing that a job may be created through end-user input from a browser interface *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches wherein the data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup is used to produce a user interface for generating a job definition statement, by disclosing that the browser creates one or more workflow forms *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, which are created based on information in a workflow template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup.

Park teaches generating data for executing a process for generating a job definition statement based on contents set by a user via the user interface in accordance with the stencil for the job definition statement and the data prescribing the

user interface for job definition statement setup and generating the job definition statement by executing the process in accordance with the generated data, by disclosing a technique for creating a job that automatically generates separate job specification files for each distinct set of user inputs *[paragraph 41, lines 15-18]* by using a workflow template file (containing a template script and workflow markup) along with user input *[paragraph 41, lines 4-7]*.

Park teaches that the stencil and the data prescribing the user interface for job definition statement setup are stored in a computer-readable storage medium, by disclosing that a development server includes a conventional memory and a conventional processor which implements the website development methods of the present invention by executing software stored in memory *[paragraph 21, lines 1-5]*. Thus, the workflow template files, scripts, and forms are stored in memory, prior for generating data for executing the process.

Park teaches the claim of the method wherein the user interface is capable of opening a window, which is organized to prompt a user for setup, in order to prompt the user to set the job definition statement, by disclosing a browser interface GUI that lets a user select a workflow template, such as from a menu item *[paragraph 50, lines 1-3]*.

Park teaches that based on the workflow markup, the instantiator CGI creates one or more workflow forms into which a user can enter workflow configuration information via the browser *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*. The workflow markup is written in XML *[paragraph 41, lines 5-6]*.

Park does not expressly disclose the data prescribing the user interface for setting the job definition statement contains control data for specifying whether or not to display a window that can open subsequently to a preceding window depending on a user response to the preceding window.

McFedries teaches that Internet Explorer is capable of opening a link in a new window *[page 356]*. Since Park teaches that the user interface includes using a browser window, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Internet Explorer as the browser, since it is widely available to many users. Thus, the browser window would contain control data for specifying whether or not to display a window that can open subsequently to a preceding window depending on a user response to the preceding window.

14. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al (Pub No US 2001/0039594 A1).

Claims 7-8

14-1. Regarding claim 7, Park teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See section 11-1. Park teaches that a template script can insert text into a job specification programmatically *[paragraph 59, lines 6-7]* using the Perl programming language *[paragraph 58, line 2]*.

Park does not expressly disclose the stencil for the job definition statement contains, in accordance with a user selection made via the user interface, a definition statement for invalidating a specific description written in the stencil.

However, examiner takes Official Notice that the Perl programming language contains conditional statements, which can be used to invalidate a specific description or portion of text.

Since the template script defines the workflow markups *[paragraph 56, lines 6-7]* used to create workflow forms into which a user enters workflow configuration information via a browser *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a definition statement for invalidating a specific description in the stencil by using the conditional statements provided by the Perl programming language in order to allow the user to have better control of text inserted into the job specification programmatically, since examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known that the Perl programming language contains conditional statements.

14-2. Regarding claim 8, Park teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See section 11-1. Park teaches that the template script can insert text into a job specification programmatically *[paragraph 59, lines 6-7]* using the Perl programming language *[paragraph 58, line 2]*.

Park does not expressly disclose the stencil for the job definition statement contains, in accordance with a user selection made via the user interface, a definition

statement issuing an instruction for generating a job definition statement in which a specific description written in the stencil is repeatedly written

However, examiner takes Official Notice that the Perl programming language contains loop statements, which can be used to repeatedly write a specific description or portion of text.

Since the template script defines the workflow markups *[paragraph 56, lines 6-7]* used to create workflow forms into which a user enters workflow configuration information via a browser *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a definition statement for invalidating a specific description in the stencil by using the loop statements provided by the Perl programming language in order to allow the user to have better control of text inserted into the job specification programmatically, since examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known that the Perl programming language contains loop statements.

Response to Arguments

15. The Examiner acknowledges the Applicants' amendments to claims 1-10, 12-14, 16, and 18-20. Regarding independent claims 1, 10, 12, 13, and 14, the Applicants allege that Park et al (Pub No US 2001/0039594) as described in the previous Office action, does not teach data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup which is used to produce a user interface for generating a job definition statement, as has been added to each of the claims. Examiner presents that Park

teaches a browser that creates one or more workflow forms *[paragraph 52, lines 1-4]*, which are created based on information in a workflow template file *[paragraph 49, lines 2-5]*. Data is entered by users based on the rules in the workflow template file and configuration instructions to create a job specification *[paragraph 49, lines 5-11]*. Thus, the workflow template file contains data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup. Applicants also allege that Park et al as described in the previous Office action, does not teach storing in a computer-readable storage medium the data prescribing a user interface for job definition statement setup. Examiner presents that Park teaches a development server that includes a conventional memory and a conventional processor which implements the website development methods of the present invention by executing software stored in memory *[paragraph 21, lines 1-5]*. Thus, the workflow template files, scripts, and forms are stored in memory, prior for generating data for executing the process.

Regarding independent claim 16, Applicants allege that Park et al as described in the previous Office action, does not teach a generating a wizard window using the data prescribing a user interface for setting the policy rule which is stored in the storage section. Park teaches, however, that one or more workflow forms are created where the user enters workflow configuration information via the browser. The validity of the data entered by the user is verified. If the data does not meet necessary criteria, the interface re-prompts the user so that data can be re-entered *[paragraphs 52 and 53]*. Thus, the interface guides the user through configuration.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Applicants allege that Park et al as described in the previous Office action, does not teach storing the control data for specifying whether or not to display a window that can open subsequently to a preceding window depending on a user response to the preceding window. Examiner has thus, included a reference that teaches Internet Explorer is capable of opening new windows depending on user response [see section 11-1], for further clarification.

Applicants state that dependent claims 2-9, and 11, recite all the limitations of the independent claims, and thus, are allowable in view of the remarks set forth regarding independently amended claims 1 and 10. However, as discussed above, Park is considered to teach claims 1 and 10, and consequently, claims 2-9 and 11 are rejected.

Applicants state that dependent claims 17-20 recite all the limitations of the independent claims, and thus, are allowable in view of the remarks set forth regarding independently amended claims 16. However, as discussed above, Park and Santos-Gomez are considered to teach claim 16, and consequently, claims 17-20 are rejected.

The Applicants' arguments have thus been considered, but are not persuasive.

Conclusion


16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin H. Tan whose telephone number is 571-272-8595. The examiner can normally be reached between 8:30am-4:30pm, Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AHT
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Cabeca', is written over the printed name of the Assistant Examiner.